

REMARKS

Claims 1-41 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 11, 20, 22, 29, 35, and 38 have been amended as shown at pages 2-8 of the Reply.

Applicant's Representative thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephonic interview on November 29, 2007. Examiner Saint-Cyr was contacted to discuss the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a). During the interview, it was agreed upon that clarification to the 'linguistically accurate translation' language could be made to address the rejections identified in the Final Office Action. These amendments have been incorporated into the claims as shown above. Furthermore, amendments presented are believed to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicants' Representative believes that the present application is in condition for allowance, therefore prompt and favorable action is respectfully requested.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-30, and 33-37 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-30, and 33-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Liddy *et al.*, (U.S. Patent No. 6,006,221). Withdrawal of the rejection is requested for at least the following reason. Liddy *et al.* does not expressly or inherently describe each and every aspect set forth in the subject claims.

In particular, the claimed invention translates result data *utilizing context to provide a linguistically accurate translation that conforms to the proper punctuation, syntax, and semantics of a specified language*. The Specification teaches utilization of context to receive or retrieve additional information associated with the text to be translated. (*See* pg. 9, ll. 19-22). One technique that provides additional detail for accurate translations includes receiving context metadata associated with the text to be translated. (*See* pg. 9, ll. 24-25). If there are several different translations, context information determines translation that is the most accurate. (*See* pg. 9-10, ll. 29-31, 1-2). For example, the additional context metadata that is retrieved could include information regarding grammar, punctuation, syntax, semantics, formatting, and incorporate this information into the translation process. (*See* pg. 11, ll. 28-29). Additionally, proper relationship between elements of an operable structure of language is preserved. (*See* pg. 12, ll. 5-6). For example, if a comma or punctuation is not appropriate in a sentence after the

translation has occurred, the comma is removed to preserve clarity and readability. The advantage of translating a document with proper syntactic and semantic format is that it provides a linguistically accurate translation that human users will find easier to read. Liddy *et al.* does not disclose or suggest at least these novel aspects.

Although Liddy *et al.* discloses utilizing local context, domain knowledge, and global information for disambiguation, the cited reference is silent with regard to *providing a linguistically accurate translation that conforms to the proper punctuation, syntax, and semantics of a specified language.* (See col. 11, ll. 59-63). Unlike the claimed invention, Liddy *et al.* only utilizes local context for disambiguation for words having multiple meanings and only performs a surface-level, gloss transliteration, sufficient for a non-fluent reader to gain a basic understanding of the document's contents. (See col. 3, ll. 11-13). Clearly, a surface-level gloss transliteration fails to provide the advantage of a linguistically accurate translation because it limits a reader to a basic understanding of the document.

Additionally, independent claims 11, 20, 22, 29, and 35 recite aspects similar to claim 1: translating a query result, *upon retrieval of the data and utilizing context information to facilitate a linguistically accurate translation that conforms to the proper punctuation, syntax, and semantics of a specified language.* In view of the foregoing, it is readily apparent that Liddy *et al.* does not disclose or suggest all claimed aspects, and therefore it is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 31, 32, and 38-41 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 31, 32, and 38-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Liddy *et al.* in view of Park *et al.* It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for the following reason. Liddy *et al.* and Park *et al.*, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element set forth in the subject amended claims. In particular, Park *et al.* does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Liddy *et al.* with respect to independent claims 29 and 38 (from which claims 31, 32, and 39-41 depend, respectively). Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP605US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731